

REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

The Office Action mailed August 13, 2004, has been carefully reviewed in light of the Examiner's helpful comments and suggestions.

As a result of the Office Action, claims 7 and 8 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Qiao in view of Tai, Suzuki, and U.S. 5,521,797 to Kashima. These references have been carefully reviewed but are not believed to show or suggest Applicants' claimed invention in any manner. Reconsideration and allowance of the pending claims is therefore respectfully requested in view of the following remarks.

The claimed invention is characterized in that a diffusion and reflection plate has a coating of diffusion and reflection material formed on the rear side surface thereof and disposed to oppose the rear side surface of the light guide, the material has a diffusion and reflection property, wherein the coating is formed by screen dot printing of a pigment including titanium white so as to diffuse and reflect the light from the rear side surface.

Since the coating is formed on the rear side surface of the diffusion and reflection plate, the light is used to illuminate the display panel without waste. Thus, the display panel can be efficiently illuminated.

To the contrary, titanium white is not formed on the rear side surface of the light conducting plate 1 of the Kashima device. A part of the light is absorbed by the rear side surface, although reflective sheet of Ag is attached on the rear side surface. Therefore, the Kashima device cannot use the light effectively. Therefore, it is respectfully submitted the claims 7 and 8 are patentable over the prior art

combination.

Each issue raised in the Office Action mailed August 13, 2004, has been addressed. Applicants respectfully request that the Section 103 obviousness rejection be withdrawn.

Respectfully submitted,
DENNISON, SCHULTZ,
DOUGHERTY & MACDONALD

By: 

Amir H. Behnia
Reg. No. 50,215
(703) 837-9600 Ext. 16